

SLAVOCRACY AGAINST DEMOCRACY ... THE GREAT CAUSE OF THE REBELLION.

14.

REMARKS OF THE HON. LORENZO SHERWOOD,

Ex-Member of the Texan Legislature,

ON THE COURSE OF THE SLAVEHOLDERS' CONSPIRACY AGAINST DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT.

"The leaders in this Rebellion are actuated by a distinct purpose to SUPPLANT POPULAR GOVERNMENT AND ESTABLISH A MONARCHY," with "Slavery as its corner-stone."

When first addressing his northern fellow-countrymen, Col. Hamilton, the last Democratic Congressman from Texas, thus pointed to the cause and the cure of the Rebellion. Referring to the declarations of prominent slaveholders, that they "must get rid of the last and least remains of Democracy," Col. H. said:

"If you could, as I have done, hear in the hotels and in the streets, and in parlors, echoes of that sentiment from men who, two years ago, were regarded as loyal, saying, '*Republicanism is a failure*—we are astonished that we ever thought it could succeed; *we now realize the fact that we must have a stronger Government*'—if you knew it as I know it, you would feel, fellow-citizens, that there was something more involved in this revolution than a simple desire to get rid of the hated Yankee.' It is not because the men who inaugurated it hated the people of the North—it was not because they felt that you had seriously wronged them—but it was a deliberate purpose on their part to be the controlling spirits in *a new and a different order of Government*, where their power would be perpetual, and they would not be subjected to the chances of the free choice of a free people in recurring elections, as had been the case in past time in our country; and he that does not realize that fact to-day, does not yet understand what that rebellion means, and, by consequence, *the man that is to-day flattering himself that, by conciliatory measures, by kind words, by peace-offerings, the disloyal States can be caused to resume their position in the Confederacy, is woefully deceived*—it never will happen in that way. There is but one remedy, and that is in the physical power of the loyal people of the North—the physical power, directed by the exercise of sufficient thought to lead you to just conclusions as to *what the consequences are to be to you*, as well as to the balance of the people of the United States, *in case of failure*."

* * * "I have grown wearied and disgusted with the mawkish sensibility over the negro, when there is so much higher and more available ground to take in favor of the white man," says Lorenzo Sherwood. * * * "My sympathies are enlisted in the great cause of *white humanity in its shirt-sleeves*—of that twenty-seven millions of American free citizens who are bound to the eternal business of subsistence through their own industry. Their lot is to toll to toil from generation to generation: and a pretty business it is for less than one hundred thousand slaveholders to set these willing millions to cutting one another's throats!"

THE SLAVEHOLDERS' REBELLION—ITS ORIGIN AND OBJECTS

The following correspondence, showing the estimate placed on the opinions of the Hon. Lorenzo Sherwood by Col. Hamilton, of Texas, may serve as an introduction to the annexed outlines of the late speech of Mr. Sherwood, in New Jersey, concerning the Origin and Objects of the Slaveholders' Rebellion:

CORRESPONDENCE.

NEW YORK, 82 Pine St., Oct. 18, 1862.

COL. ANDREW JACKSON HAMILTON.

Dear Sir—Knowing the profound interest with which you watch the diffusion of information concerning the real motives influencing the Slaveholders' Conspiracy, I respectfully submit for your consideration a proof-sheet of the outlines of the Hon. Lorenzo Sherwood's late speech in New Jersey, with the belief that an expression of your opinion concerning his statements and reasonings would still further commend them to the consideration of your loyal countrymen South and North, and to the friends of free government in other lands, who wish to know the true causes of the attempted destruction, not only of our National Government, but of democratic institutions, by the slave-aristocracy, at the present crisis.

As no one knows better than you do the opportunities of Mr. Sherwood for learning thoroughly and correctly appreciating all branches of information concerning these vital questions—opportunities afforded by his long Southern experience and his intimate connection with public affairs (in

and out of the Legislature) of Texas; and as I know the cordiality with which you and Mr. Sherwood have co-operated in sustaining loyal sentiments in the South, and in endeavoring to cause the true motives of the rebellion to be correctly understood among your Northern fellow-countrymen, as set forth in the publications of the Democratic League, I am sure you will not consider intrusive this request for an expression of your opinion on the above-mentioned points.

Yours, respectfully,

HENRY O'REILLY.

REPLY.

NEW YORK, OCT. 18, 1862.

MY DEAR SIR:—Your note of to-day, calling my attention to, and asking my opinion of, the facts and arguments contained in a proof-sheet of the outlines of the Hon. Lorenzo Sherwood's late speech in New Jersey, is before me. But a few moments are left me for reply, as I am in the act of leaving the city.

I fully concur in all that is contained in that speech. These are matters not new to either Mr. Sherwood or myself; nor do we now for the first time interchange opinions upon them. Together we have, in years past, watched the inevitable tendency in the South to the present deplorable condition of our country. There are few men of my acquaintance who are so well prepared, from observation, experience and reflection, to think wisely and act justly in the premises as Mr. Sherwood.

Very truly and respectfully,

A. J. HAMILTON.

To HENRY O'REILLY, Esq.

SPEECH OF LORENZO SHERWOOD,

EX-MEMBER OF THE TEXAN LEGISLATURE,

RESPECTING THE SLAVEHOLDERS' CONSPIRACY AGAINST DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES, AS WELL AS AGAINST THE NATIONAL UNION.

MY FREE FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN:

I thus designate you, in contradistinction to the masses in the South, who are now under the sway of despotism, and who are no longer free. Hard as this word is to speak, and painful as it is to contemplate, the declaration is true. Those who have heretofore sympathized with you in the belief that they had enduring free government, and who are attached to its principles, find themselves suddenly transferred to the degradation of a most mercenary and relentless despotism. I come to you to-night to disclose and elucidate the full meaning of the conspiracy that has deprived them of their political rights; to excite your generous sympathy in their behalf; and, if possible, to increase your animated determination to uphold that clause of the Constitution which guarantees to the people of every State "free republican government."

If I arrogate to myself something of special information, and more than is common to most others, it is only for the reason that I have been placed more immediately in contact with those who have co-operated in this great Southern conspiracy, fitly denominated "The Slaveholders' Rebellion." It is a conspiracy, not only against the national jurisdiction, but a most foul conspiracy also against free government in the South. I is this phase of the question that I would discuss, for it is as patent to my mind that a new order of government, based on privilege of class, is intended to be established, as it is that the national jurisdiction has been repudiated. If any one could have seen what I have seen, heard what I have heard, and watched and analyzed what has been thrust upon my attention during my fourteen years' residence in the South, he would have little difficulty in concluding as to the motives of the rebellion.

Whoever is placed in immediate contact with the reasonings of a class, and follows up that course of reasoning through a series of years, will have little difficulty in divining the ulterior motives of that class, however much the attempt may be made to disguise them. The motives will crop out from the line of reasoning. When slaveholders talk against "a government of majorities," it means something. When they talk about the necessity of "abrogating a government of majorities," it swells into significance of something more than idle theory. It means an intended new arrangement of political power. When you see a periodical like De Bow's Review, which is the oracle and organ of the slaveholders, and the sacred depository of the political literature of their class, you may gather from the tenor of its pages something of what is meant. If you never find a generous democratic sentiment on its pages, you may conclude that

its authors or contributors do not entertain such sentiments. If you discover that democratic principles are repudiated as vicious in theory and vile in practice, you may know that such principles are objectionable. When you hear the democratic masses reviled, and continuously reviled, in the standard political literature of a class, you may know that those masses are condemned by that class as an objectionable political element. I had every reason to believe, and did believe before secession, that the object of the slaveholders was to overthrow the democratic principle.

When the rebellion actually took place, it revived in my mind many things, previously spoken by slaveholders, that would otherwise have been forgotten. It was then that the many and repeated declarations I had heard through a series of years assumed a significant meaning that dispelled all doubt. Later revelations only tended to confirm the foregone conclusion as to the intent of the slaveholders—that is, the abrogation of democratic government in the South.

As an additional evidence of the plot to secede, as well as the motive, the real, secret motive for secession, I will read the letter of Mr. Garnett to Mr. Trescott, written in 1851. (The speaker here read the letter.) This letter has a most important bearing and most portentous meaning. It was written in secret confidence. It was written by a leading traitor to a leading traitor. It was written just after the Nashville Convention of 1850, where the plot to secede, as is now ascertained, was adopted and determined on. It was written in answer to a treasonable letter, with the sentiments of which Mr. Garnett sympathized. "You well object to the term Democrat," says Mr. Garnett: "Democracy is, indeed, incompatible with slavery and the whole system of Southern society." This was a truth which had become patent to the minds of slaveholders, and very few at this time, I think, are prepared to dispute the proposition. Whoever undertakes to controvert the proposition, will be at issue with the political influences now controlling the South.

As far back as 1855, in the July number of De Bow's Review, we find an article written by an eminent Southerner, containing the following reasonings and postulates. Speaking of the Democratic theory, he says: "At the bottom of this theory lies the idea that might makes right; in other words, that a majority of the members of society has a natural, indefeasible, and absolute right to govern the minority. * * * The majority of numbers is more powerful than the Czar, because it is *physical right*. It is more grinding in its tyranny, because it has less feeling of personal responsibility, and its Argus eyes

can search every corner of the country. Its infallibility is less open to attack than the Pope's, because it is, itself, public opinion." The author assumes that "in England the ability in government has been preserved by a highly aristocratic Constitution, both social and political."

It may not be unprofitable, in elucidation of this subject, to recite in addition a few declarations and postulates from the present philosophers of the South. I would take up those whose opinions have passed current, and are in conformity with the designs of treason. Mr. George Fitzhugh, of Va., has more than emulated South Carolina in the expression of his motives to get rid of the Union. In the February number of De Bow's Review, 1861, he assumes "that it is a great mistake to suppose that abolition alone was the cause of dissension between the North and the South." He assumes "that the Cavaliers, Jacobites, and Huguenots, who settled the South, naturally hate, contemn, and despise the Puritans who settled the North. The former are master races; the latter, a slave race, the descendants of Saxon serfs. The former are Mediterranean races, descendants of the Romans; for Cavaliers and Jacobites are of Norman descent, and the Normans were of Roman descent, and so were the Huguenots. The Saxons and Angles, the ancestors of the Yankees, came from the cold and marshy regions of the north, where man is little more than an amphibious biped." He assumes, further, "that the Union has served its purposes; that at the North the progress and tendency of opinion was to pure democracy; that the South must so modify its institutions as to remove the people farther from the direct exercise of power; that it was a characteristic of the progress of opinion in the South, that all men see the necessity of more and stronger government; that the people of the South were the most aristocratic people in the world; and, to conclude, that aristocracy is the only safeguard of liberty, and the only power watchful and strong enough to exclude monarchical despotism." I cite these passages for the purpose of showing the repugnance of the author, and the school to which he belongs, to the democratic principle in government.

In an Essay written by J. Quitman Moore of Mississippi, and published in De Bow's Review, in 1861, the author makes the following postulate: "Those pestilent and pernicious dogmas, 'the greatest good to the greatest number,' 'the majority shall rule,' are, in their practical application, the fruitful source of disorders never to be quieted, revolutions the most radical and sanguinary, philosophies the most false, and passions the most wild, destructive, and ungovernable."

"In America," says this author, "by reason of the operations of causes wholly extraneous to considerations of government and society, the republican experiment has been favored and prolonged beyond recorded precedent; but, painful as the reflection must be to all such as subscribed to the utopian philosophy, and have an abiding faith in the capacity of man for continuous and enlightened self-rule, it must be confessed that the experiment of the democratic Republic of America has failed."

"THE REMEDY.—The institution of an hereditary senate and executive is the political form best suited to the genius, and most expressive of the ideas, of the South; but, at the same time, a polity wholly incapable of realization, so long as the individual States retain the attribute of independent sovereignty, and party passions and interests are permitted to stifle the expression of an enlightened and patriotic public sentiment."

"The institution of an hereditary senate and executive the political form best suited to the genins, and most expressive of the ideas of, the South"!!! If this mode of thinking is applied to the slaveholders as a class, the declaration is true beyond a doubt; but, if it is intended to apply to the seven millions non-slaveholding masses, the demoeratic element in the South, it is not true, even in degree, and mortal man, professing to stand in the image of his maker, never unsealed his lips to utter so foul and detestable a falsehood.

In this programme for a Southern government, we have also an illustration of Southern hypocrisy in relation to the much-vaunted "State-rights" doctrine. It has been used as a pretense, a means to assist in throwing off the national jurisdiction. In the minds of the traitors it meant nothing more. It was merely used as a catchword to inaugurate treason. As soon as revolution was supposed to be accomplished, another and a very different doctrine is immediately put forth. A consolidated government, an hereditary senate and executive, suddenly become the political form "best suited to the genius" of these recent advocates of State rights.

Mr. Stephens, of Georgia, at the time of giving in his adhesion to the Southern Confederacy, had the candor to acknowledge, in part, the hypocrisy of the South as to the reasons for secession. He urged the indispensable necessity of founding a new government, based on the social system of the South, with "Slavery as its corner-stone." Mr. Spratt, of S. C., in his famous letter to Perkins, of Louisiana, reproves the disingenuous accusations against the North made by Southern politicians, stating that no man who deserved the name of statesman in the South would pretend that secession was caused by any aggression of the North upon the rights of the people of the South; that it was still less the result of any act on the part of the United States Government." His argument in favor of taking the government from the "heels of society" and placing it in "the head," is quite as significant of meaning as Mr. Moore's proposition for an hereditary senate and executive.

As incident to a combined monarchical and aristocratic form of government, it is well known that entails and the rights of primogeniture are indispensable. In an article written by George Fitzhugh, of Va., and published in De Bow's Review in 1859, advocating entails and primogeniture, he says—

"Entails of land should include enough to sustain and keep employed at various arts and avocations an almost independent social circle. The landowner's spare profits should enable him

to educate well and start in life his younger sons, either as mechanics, artists, or professional men, and, with economy, to lay up small portions for his daughters. To effect these objects, he must have a farming tenantry, with hired laborers under them, or must farm it himself, and employ many laborers. These, with his younger children, and elder ones not in business, and poor and dependent relatives, would form a natural and patriarchal circle, secure from the fluctuations of trade. In all but name, the owner of the entailed estate would be the master, and his family, tenants, laborers, and dependents his servants. It would be an easy way of getting back to predial slavery, without incurring the odium of the name. Give us entails, and we promise you a mild and modified form of domestic slavery. We are no experimenting socialist; we propose nothing new, but only to return to the institutions ordained by God, and tested and approved by human experience."

I might continue these recitals, indicating the intentions of those who inaugurated the rebellion; but, I have not time to proceed with them further on this occasion. These secret motives to overthrow free government in the south, were as carefully concealed from the non-slaveholding masses in the South as they were from the twenty millions in the North. Had they been promulgated as the basis of revolution, the conspiracy would have been crushed by Southern strength alone. The traitors would have been hurled from place and power by the democratic masses, had the secret motives to the treason been understood; but, the masses in the South had been as much deceived by false pretences and the hypocrisy of the leading traitors, as the freemen of the North. The twenty-seven millions, North and South, have been alike deceived, and most of them are laboring under the same delusion to-day.

It was indispensably necessary to the purposes of the rebellion, that false pretences and false motives should be held out. When the rebels entered upon the plot of treason many years ago, political strategy was the great weapon with which to inaugurate it. They had no more scruple on the score of falsehood and deceit than military men have under the usages of war. Whilst they professed to love the Government and the Union, they were hypocritically plotting to overthrow it. They used every art to gain confidence with Northern men, whilst secretly intending to betray it. We have still many men in the North, as well as in the South, who are yet blinded as to the real motives of the traitors, and I have sometimes thought that those most deluded were connected with the administration at Washington, and the generals who are commanding, not to say leading, our armies.

The great mistake that has been made by the administration, and the leading influences that have controlled it, has grown out of the idea that slaveholders as a class, could be conciliated—that some arrangement could be made whereby the South could be restored through their agency. The continuation of that mistake, if persisted in, will lose the whole Union cause. The

slaveholding conspirators are haters of democracy. To get rid of democracy and its future sway under the laws of population and subsistence, they risked the institution of slavery; they risked the ravages of war; they risked life, and all that humanity holds most dear; but it must be remembered, that all this risk was incurred, believing that a new order of government, subverting the democratic principle, must be instituted in order to perpetuate and maintain slavery unimpaired.

When we look at the nature of the institution, and the results flowing from it, we can discover the strong pecuniary motive for maintaining it. Aside from the profits of agricultural products, sixty millions per year were added to the increase of slave property through the laws of generation. Three per cent, or thereabouts, annually compounded, added to the profits of agriculture, swelled the slaveholders' profits to 10, 12 or 15 per cent, annually. This enabled the slaveholders to monopolize the good lands and the force to cultivate them. In this way the institution was peculiarly calculated to perpetuate wealth in families, and to continue it in the family descent. But how was this descent of property, and this increase of the future millions upon millions of slaves to be held in bondage? Here were seven millions of non-slaveholders, composing the democratic element of the South. It was an enfranchised, voting power. It was attached to free government, and had drunk in the idea of free government, the same and as fully as the people of the North. This population in twenty-three to twenty-five years would swell to fourteen millions. Five decades would swell it to twenty-eight millions, whilst the same length of time would swell the slaveholding elements to six millions only. Antagonism between these democratic and anti-democratic forces were sure to rise up as population became crowded. Under this regime, the antagonistic elements in society, under the laws of population and subsistence, must soon come in conflict.

There was another consideration with slaveholders, and one of most vital energy in impelling them to the project of taking away the power of the masses. The property in slaves was political property. It depended for its duration upon the action of political forces and the policy of the State under the operation of those political forces: hence slaveholders were jealous of the masses. They were anti-democratic, from supposed necessity. They must possess and wield the exclusive political power of the State, and continue to exercise it, for whenever they lost it, and the prestige of its antagonism should come into the ascendancy, the downfall of slavery would take its date. This process of reasoning, whether true or false, was the theory of the slaveholding interests in the South. It was the impelling motive, not only for the conspiracy to throw off the national jurisdiction, but to overthrow free government in the South. When these considerations are taken into account, and the motives and purposes of slaveholders analyzed, the fallacy of attempting to conciliate them becomes apparent. Their aim and object is, and from supposed

necessity, to overthrow democracy. The effort to do this is backed not only by supposed necessity, in order to preserve slavery unimpaired, but by the whole train of ambitious motives connected with the raising up of an organized and cemented aristocracy.

When we contemplate Southern population, and separate it into classes—to say nothing of the negro—we find seven millions non-slaveholding population, democratic in its sentiments, attached to free government, and in every essential a natural element of national strength in connection with liberalized institutions. When we look at the North, we find twenty millions having the same natural motives. How is it, and why is it, that fifteen hundred thousand men, women, and children, connected in proprietorship in slavery, should have wielded a power and influence that have set the twenty-seven millions at variance, destroyed concert of action, and brought our Government to the deplorable spectacle now witnessed? Is it because, as slaveholders pretend, that "they are our natural masters"? or is it because the twenty-seven millions have been deceived—are now engaged in deceiving each other—and have been frittering away their strength and substance on the most fallacious of all delusions—the belief that the agencies which inaugurated the rebellion can be turned into an agency to restore the Union? If this be the reliance, in my belief the Union is gone.

It has been apparent to my mind, and, as I have often thought, clearly apparent, that an appeal should be made to the democratic element of the South, which as yet has never been spoken to by the Cabinet or Congress at Washington. It is now getting to be known that the political rights and liberty of this population are conspired against. It has long been known that the democracy-haters of Europe were in alliance with the traitors of the South to assist in the prostration of the democratic principle. Why should not the President of the United States proclaim to this democratic element of the South the intent of the traitors to disfranchise the masses, and to erect upon the ruins of their political rights an hereditary aristocracy? Why should not the President say to this population, "The Constitution as it is guarantees you free republican government, and, by all the powers in me vested, you shall have it"? Why does he not say to the democracy of the South, "The Constitution as it is interdicts the establishment of any order of nobility, and, by the powers in me vested, I declare that it shall not be established"? Why does he not command the generals of the army to forego their deluded sympathy in the cause of the traitors, and look to the interests of the Southern masses, whose rights are invaded and trodden down? This folly of attempting to conciliate in the wrong direction, and to fight in the wrong direction, has actually prostrated the public confidence in the administration, in the generalship of the armies, and in our financial power of endurance. This policy must be altered, or the Union is gone; and if the separation is once consummated, the restoration will never transpire.

If men would but reason with accuracy, and determine in their own minds as to what is a democratic element, and therefore an element of national strength—what is anti-democratic, and therefore, an intolerable element of national weakness—our governmental and military forces, as well as the whole people of the North, would at once be brought to act as a unit. The *political moral* of the democratic idea, in connection with arms, must fight this rebellion. If we can succeed in getting the democratic hand, North and South, laid upon this monster rebellion, we shall hear the death-rattle in its throat at once. This is what the traitors are most afraid of. This is what their apprehensions will be most sedulous to guard against. Every art of hypocrisy and false pretence will be put in requisition to prevent it. This is the vulnerable point of attack, and the rebels know it. Negro proclamations may be alarming, but this strikes another and a very different chord of sympathy in the South. It would strike upon the seven millions who have all the natural motives to political affinity with the North—the same educational motives, the same industrial motives, the same social motives, and every other motive connected with the desire to maintain free and liberal government. When we appreciate the full meaning of this conspiracy, and take the traitors at their word in presenting the issue, we shall all know how to act. When the Government and the Generals of our armies rise to the magnitude of the issue as the traitors have tendered it, they will know how to act. Treason and civil war were resorted to in order to overthrow free democratic government, because such government was "incompatible with slavery." This is the whole issue, when stripped of the false pretences that have thrown a misguided public opinion around the various incidents of the question. Let us rise to the issue in its true meaning and magnitude. When this is done, the North will become a unit. Let us appeal to the democratic masses in the South on this issue; let the arms of the nation remove the blockade to intelligence, and we shall have the bulk of those masses with us. We must take this course in order to get a strength in the South to assist in restoring the Union; and we must have this strength to hold the South steady after it is restored. We can look in no other direction for competent Southern assistance.

THE SLAVOCRACY AGAINST ADOPTED CITIZENS.

I would here close my remarks, but for an allusion which I wish to make to our adopted citizens, most of whom are in the North. Many illiberal opinions have been expressed towards this population, and more particularly by the slaveholders of the South. Allow me to cite a passage from the writings of the literary pioneer of the Know-Nothing Order. J. Fenton Mercer, of Virginia, who describes himself as a slaveholder, a man of seventy years' experience, and who is known to have held high and responsible offices for many years of his life, was a perfect type and representative man of this order of politicians. In a book written by him, published in 1845, we find the following passage: "Why has

not general suffrage destroyed the confederation? This lowest level of political corruption; this universal suffrage; this rule of vagabondism; this rushing into the temple of liberty by the Irish, Dutch and English, with unclean hands, to pollute and deface every thing sacred to the cause of freedom—are sure to defile all, undo all, and dissolve all that is valued in this confederation, when the time shall come for the consummation of the drama."

It is an easy thing, my friends, for men to rail at a class, but it is always more magnanimous to cast about, and ascertain, if we can, whether the class railed at be, or be not, an element of national strength. I have had much experience in dealing with the different elements that compose and sway political organizations. I here declare to you that I have never known an instance, in the maladministration of government, where the iniquity proceeded from the influence of what are termed the "lower orders of society." Those in the humbler walks of life cannot at a single step overleap the intermediate classes, and stand in the high places where mischievous power exerts itself in committing devastation on the public interests. Look at the recent peculations upon the national treasury:—the fault was not with the masses. Look at the recent exhibition of fraud, treason, theft, and hypoerisy connected with the odious administration of Buchanan:—the fault was not with the masses of population, either native or adopted. I could refer you to thousands of instances where men in high places, elected by the honest and well-meaning suffrages of all classes, have betrayed their trust, and engaged in the enactment of laws designed solely for mereenary speculation. Political theft is different from all other kinds of larceny. It exceeds in moral turpitude all others, and is of too high a grade for men in

the lower walks of life to be engaged in committing. Political fraud and political peculation, like military glory, seldom get below the captains.

I would now contrast these adopted citizens, and their conduct, with the conduct of these exalted Virginians and their co-revilers in the South, whose writings for years have teemed with ribaldry and revilement against democraey, against our naturalization laws, and against that class of our citizens made partakers of political power under them. These revilers in the South have long been engaged in the plot to overthrow the national jurisdiction and the political rights of the masses. Those who have been reviled are standing by the Government to maintain our free institutions. The examples in contrast should dispel illiberality, as well as the great error in which it was conceived. I admonish my countrymen to indulge in this hateful error of Southern extraction no longer—for, let me assure you that if you persist in this illiberal course, the future historic names of Sigel, and Corcoran, and their hundred and fifty thousand brave companions in arms, will prove, and justly prove, your everlasting rebuke. Calamity, it has often been said, brings out the truth or falsity of theories, inasmuch as it applies the touchstone of truth, which is found in result. I confess to you, my fellow-citizens, that when I see our adopted citizens exposing themselves to the diseases of camp life, the casualties of the battle-field, and standing side by side with our native-born to maintain free democratic government, my admiration and affection towards them are not only confirmed, but intensified. It makes me feel grateful to know that treason, or sympathy with treason, have no place in their hearts. Truly, they are an element of NATIONAL STRENGTH.

LETTERS TO HON. ANDREW JOHNSON.

The following letters to ANDREW JOHNSON of Tennessee, when in Congress last year, will further illustrate the views expressed in the speeches of Col. Hamilton and Lorenzo Sherwood, respecting the real objects of the rebel slaveholders, and indicating the proper antidote for the treason:

NEW YORK, November 25th, 1861.
Hon. ANDREW JOHNSON (in Senate),
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: What are the American armies fighting about, and what the purpose to be gained by the result of arms—are grave questions now being agitated by all classes in Europe. "What are we fighting for?" is a question with many people in the North, who have drank in the impression that the South was composed of nothing but pro-slavery interests.

I will tell you in few words what I am fighting for. I am engaged in this contest, as far as in me lies, in behalf of the non-slaveholding population in the Southern States. You know its character, and you know, at the same time, the disparagement under which it has been placed as an aggregate, ever since its birth; and you also know the helpless, hopeless condition in which it would be placed by the slaveholding power, in case it is permanently separated from its natural political affinity with the North. You know enough of the plans of secession to know its designs upon the mass of free labor South. If you do not, please trace the pages of De Bow's Review for the last ten years, and put what you find cropping out in those pages with what you must have learned to coming from individuals of high standing, and I think you need not be at a loss to discover the ultimate plan of half disfranchising the free labor of the South. It is true, this design has been covered with all

but masonic secrecy; but it has, nevertheless, been sufficiently disclosed, and continuously disclosed for the last ten years, to convince me that I am not mistaken.

The slaveholder of the South fears that the voting power of the South may become the governing power. In all my conversations with the intellectual politicians, I have observed this jealousy, this fear; and what has troubled the pro-slavery spirit most of all things, has been the contemplated probability of an affinity between the free labor North and South. When that transpires, it will prove the destruction of the pro-slavery prestige, even in the South; and we shall hear no more of plans to break up the Government, or to dismember the Union.

I have grown wearied and disgusted with the mawkish sensibility over the negro, when there is so much higher and more available ground to take in favor of the white man. Six and one-half or seven millions of white men,—their half-disparaged condition; their fitness to be free men, and their right to be disenthralled from the prejudice which the pro-slavery spirit in politics has thrust upon them—afford to my mind a just basis for Governmental consideration in the prosecution of this war.

I wish to say plainly, Sir, my sympathies are enlisted in the great cause of *white humanity in its shirt-sleeves*—of that twenty-seven millions of American free citizens who are bound to the eternal business of subsistence through their own industry. Their lot is to toil—to toil on from generation to generation; and a pretty business it is for less than one hundred thousand rebel slaveholders to set these toiling millions to cutting one another's throats!

What right, have we of the North to abandon our white non-slaveholding brethren of the South to the hopeless tyranny of an exclusive pro-slavery policy? What right has Congress to forbear the bold declaration in favor of this population, and to pledge all the adhering elements of the Government to protect it—to shelter it under the national ensign—yea, if need be, to so far humble and subordinate the pro-slavery spirit as to give encouragement in the right direction to the masses of the Southern white population?

It would be useless to say "this non-slaveholding population cannot be reached." It can be reached, and can be enlisted on the side of its own protection. Let Congress and all the governmental powers declare their solicitude for it, and determination to protect it; and let us of the North re-echo the sentiment, and hail it as a brotherhood in political destiny and political right. Arms will remove the blockade to intelligence. We shall have the mass of this population with us if we take the bold and strong means to invite it.

It strikes me that you are the man to bring out this subject through a congressional declaration. Your sympathies are known to be with the masses of the laboring white men South. You are known and marked in every part of the Union as their friend. You have the courage to do just what your conscience tells you is best.

Congresses and conventions have been truckling to rebel slaveholders and endeavoring to salve over their antipathies to the Union. No effort has made them better. Nothing can make them worse. Suppose the effort should now be made in the direction where the process of reasoning would naturally carry it. Nothing can be lost by making the attempt. A bold declaration would strike more terror into the minds of rebel slaveholders, than half a dozen Port Royal canonnades—terrific as that affair appeared. It would be worthy an American Congress and command the approval of the world. The question, "What are we fighting for," would no longer be asked.

Very truly yours, &c.,

LORENZO SHERWOOD.

NEW-YORK, November 28, 1861.

Hon. ANDREW JOHNSON (in Senate),
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

What is practicable and what is *not* practicable, by way of raising up a Southern Union party, or co-operating strength, is now the question. That there should be a congressional declaration of something else than worn-out generalities, I have no doubt. That there should be something said that is sufficiently specific to strike upon some chord of natural sympathy, appears more and more to me to be necessary.

The suggestions I forwarded to you have gained upon my mind since I wrote you, and the policy of an appeal to the free labor South, and the separation of the Southern population into classes, so as to throw the responsibility of the rebellion upon the small numerical class that inaugurated it, is more apparent to my mind than when I last wrote you.

I think we have much to gain by Southern indiscretion. The slip I send you is indicative of the developing design of secession, and is corroborative of the motive I alluded to in the suggested resolutions.

The moral force of the Southern programme must be struck at its vulnerable point. What is that vulnerable point? My long residence in the extreme South convinces me that the intended disfranchisement of the Southern masses is the most prominent cause of Southern discontent; and that the exemplification of this intent by a congressional declaration would tend to establish a more effective hold upon the Union sentinel South, than any thing else that could be put forth.

I am aware that nearly every Union man, South, who has been accustomed to play the Southern political game in politics, is stereotyped in the idea that any thing that tends directly or remotely to the policy of emancipation should be avoided. They seem to forget the political necessity of making the declaration to the effect, that *protection and allegiance must go together*; that this is a political, social, national, and above all, in the midst of the effusion of blood, an imperative and unavoidable war necessity. We shall come to this, and the sooner the declaration is

made, in connection with other considerations, in my humble opinion the better.

In the midst of tribulation, under democratic government, every sensitive man of impulse persuades himself into the belief that he is a competent adviser. We shall have a thousand and one distractions as to the declared motives which exist for the prosecution of the war. They are already being put forth in different sections, and the Government at Washington is as little understood in its views of policy as in its unpublished military designs. I think it time, in order to avoid public distraction in the North, and to show to the world that there is such a thing as definite motive in Government policy, founded on some tangible principle, to make an authoritative congressional declaration of some kind; and the more pointed it is, if founded on just principle, the better. I doubt whether you could find an abolitionist *per se* who would strike the right point. I also doubt whether any politician from the Gulf States, however strong in his Union sentiments, would dare venture upon any definite declaration that would be specific. You will excuse my suggestions; they are made under the belief that something effective must be done in connection with arms to raise up a Southern

strength to our side. If we cannot do it, the Union is gone. I hope it may never be said of us, that we have lost our strength and the force of the Union cause through timidity.

Are we not brought by the determined spirit of rebellion to deal with all its opposing elements affirmatively? Has not all forbearance been construed into timidity? It has seemed to me that the disposition to forego as long as possible any resort to force by the national Government has been an ill-devised humanity, that has resulted merely in preparation for a more extensive effusion of blood. If anything is yet to be gained by paltering to the influences that have inaugurated this treason against the common population and common interest of the country, I cannot see it. Perhaps those better skilled in political philosophy may be able to do so. I fear, however, that those who have so long failed to appreciate the nature, strength, and motives of this rebellion will be slow—quite too slow—in the enunciation of views or principles in connection with the plan of raising up a Southern party, and of strengthening the North by keeping it a unit.

Very truly, &c.,

LORENZO SHERWOOD.

(POSTSCRIPT TO THE SECOND EDITION.)

From the New York Tribune, Oct. 21.

The "Origin and Objects of the Slaveholders' Conspiracy against Democratic Principles, as well as against the National Union," illustrated in the Speeches of ANDREW JACKSON HAMILTON, of Texas, the statements of LORENZO SHERWOOD, late of Texas; the letter of Muscoe R. H. GARNETT, late Democratic Member of Congress from Virginia, to William H. Trescott, of South Carolina, showing the antagonism of Democracy and Free Labor to Slavery and its Rebellion; the Letter of the Democratic League of our City to John Bright, &c., has just been compiled for that League by HENRY O'REILLY, and is now printed in a neat pamphlet, which can be had at our office. If there is a sincere and loyal Democrat in this State, who now thinks of voting for Seymour & Co., we are confident that a careful reading of this pamphlet would dissuade him from so doing. Please look into it, and judge if you ought not to aid in circulating it.